

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Pat nt and Trad mark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIDST NAMES (
•			FIRST NAMED IN	IVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
	09/092,158	06/05/98	MERCHANT		s	MERCHANT3333
٦.			MMC2/0620	٦		EXAMINER
	CHARLES W (HITT CHWANG		· = •		EATON	I, K
	225 UNIVERS	BITY PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	275 WEST CA RICHARDSON	AMPBELL ROAD			2823 Date Mailed:	
						06/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	09/092,158	MERCHANT ET AL.				
omce Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kurt M Eaton					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION	VIC SET TO EVEN					
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SiX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commuter. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) dispersion of the considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute communication. Fallure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, 	B7 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, how inication. ays, a reply within the statutory minery period will apply and will expire	nimum of thirty (30) days will				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06</u>		,				
7a\\\/ TE'= -+	his action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under		ters, prosecution as to the merits is				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 2, 4-12, and 14-24</u> is/are pending	in the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s)is/are allowed.	with thom consideration.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 2, 4-12, and 14-24</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claims are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement					
pplication Papers	ciection requirement.					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	_					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to	by the Examiner.					
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	_is: a)∐ approved b)∏ d	isapproved.				
	aminer.					
iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:						
1.☐ received.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	amonto have been.				
2. received in Application No. (Series Code	/ Serial Number)					
3. received in this National Stage application	from the International Bure	eau (PCT Bula 47 2/a))				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	the certified copies not rec	eived				
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domest						
chment(s)						
□ v. v						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18\ Intendance					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) information Disciosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/092,158

Art Unit: 2823

· 6 / 4

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-12, 14-17, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants admitted prior art in view of Schinella and Chen, as previously applied in the office action mailed 12/28/99.

Additionally, and with regards to claims 1 and 12, the admitted prior art shows depositing the barrier layer by PVD techniques {page 3, lines 13-22}.

Response to Arguments

- Applicant's arguments filed 4/6/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 4. First off, the examiner respectfully submits that claims 1-6, 8-17, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants admitted prior art *in view of* Schinella and Chen, *not* as being unpatentable over the applicants admitted prior art *and* in view of Schinella and Chen. In the former instance, the claims are rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of three references and in the latter instance, the claims can be interpreted as being unpatentable in two different ways: over one single reference and a combination of two references.

Application/Control Number: 09/092,158 Art Unit: 2823

·c ·** •

With regards to applicants arguments concerning the Schinella and Chen references, and more specifically that one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the teachings of Schinella and Chen, the examiner wholeheartedly agrees with the applicant. However, the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-17, and 19-22 was based upon a combination of the applicants admitted prior art in view of Schinella and Chen. Accordingly, the teachings of Chen were not combined with the teachings of Schinella. Rather, the teachings of Schinella were used to modify the teachings of the applicants admitted prior art and the teachings of Chen were used to modify the teachings of the applicants admitted prior art in view of Schinella.

The examiner respectfully submits that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually and incompletely where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Ca.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In other words, nonobviousness must be shown by attacking the combinations the applicants admitted prior art with Schinella and/or Chen.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Paper related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2823 by facsimile 6.

transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 2823 via the Art Unit 2823 Fax Center located in

Crystal Plaza 4, room 4C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in

the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989). The Art Unit 2823 Fax Center number is

(703) 308-7722 or -7724. The Art Unit 2823 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Art

Unit 2823 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication of earlier communication from the examiner

should be directed to Kurt Eaton at (703) 305-0383 and between the hours of 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM

(Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday or by e-mail via kurt.eaton@uspto.gov.

OLIK CHAUDHURI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800